

REMARKS

Claims 7, 12, 13 and 15 - 31 are in this application and are presented for consideration. Claims 7 and 12 have been amended, and new claims 15 through 31 have been added.

The independent claims have been previously rejected as being anticipated or obvious over Jentzsch '833 in view of Horikoshi '855.

With this amendment applicant is adding new independent claim 25 which sets forth a roll arrangement for a printing press which prints a plurality of printing areas transversely across a web. Claim 25 also sets forth that the ink friendly areas have a width substantially equal to a width of a respective printing area. Support for this can be found in the specification in paragraphs 10 and 26. Jentzsch '833 is used to teach the ink friendly areas of a roll in a printing press. However Jentzsch '833 does describe the width of any ink friendly areas to be substantially equal to a width of a respective printing area. Therefore it is applicant's position that new independent claim 25 cannot be anticipated by Jentzsch '833.

Applicant also finds no suggestion nor motivation to modify Jentzsch '833 to have a width of any ink friendly area to be substantially equal to a width of a respective printing area. Applicants review of Jentzsch '833 finds that the areas 6 are purposely arranged to only partially fill any printing areas, and that Jentzsch '833 recommends that the areas 6 be irregularly sized and positioned. This is understandable in Jentzsch '833, because the purpose of Jentzsch '833 is to eliminate interference templates, and to break up any patterns which may be forming on adjacent rollers. It is applicant's position that using ink friendly areas sized as in claim 25, would not achieve the objective of Jentzsch '833. Therefore any proposed

modification of Jentzsch '833 to the size of the ink friendly areas set forth in claim 25, would render Jentzsch '833 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Applicant notes that such a modification is not an indication of obviousness.

Claims 15 and 22 also set forth similar features regarding the width of the printing areas and the ink friendly areas. It is applicant's position that claims 15 and 22 therefore also define over the prior art.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to set forth that the damping system is for a printing press printing a plurality of printing areas. A plate cylinder is set forth as having printing areas to print on the printing areas of the web, and the ink repellent material is set forth as having a size to prevent mixing of ink between printing areas of the plate cylinder. The embodiment of present figure 4 shows the plate cylinder by reference numerals 3. Support for this feature can be found in the specification in paragraphs 10 and 27. Applicant has reviewed Jentzsch '833, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of any ink repellent materials having the size set forth in claim 7. It does not appear that Jentzsch '833 is concerned with a plurality of printing areas, and the mixing of ink from one printing area into another. Therefore it is applicant's position that there is no suggestion nor motivation to modify any ink repellent materials in Jentzsch '833 to have the size set forth in claim 7. Claim 7 therefore cannot be anticipated, or obvious, in view of the applied prior art.

Claim 21 also sets forth similar features regarding the size of the ink repellent material. It is applicant's position that claim 21 therefore also defines over the applied prior art.

Independent claim 18 sets forth a distributing roll (element 12 in the embodiment of

figure 4) and a damping agent transfer roll (element 13 in the embodiment of figure 4) in contact with the distributing roll. The damping agent transfer roll transfers damping agent to the distributing roll. A damping agent applicator roll (element 11 in the embodiment of figure 4) is set forth as being in contact with the distributing roll, and receiving damping agent from the distributing roll. Such an arrangement of rolls is not taught nor suggested in Jentzsch '833. Instead Jentzsch '833 describes a bridge roller which is in contact with ink roll 2 and/or damp roll 3. Applicant finds no indication that any of the rollers in Jentzsch '833 are arranged to transfer damping agent to a distributing roller, and then to receive damping agent from the distributing roller. Applicant notes that an inking roll, such as element 2 in Jentzsch '833, would not receive damping agent. Instead the purpose of such an inking roll would be only to receive ink. Therefore the arrangement of rolls in Jentzsch '833 does not anticipate all of the rolls set forth in new independent claim 18.

Applicant further finds no suggestion nor motivation to modify Jentzsch '833 to have the rolls set forth in claim 18, or to include the roll 4 of Jentzsch '833 in a roll arrangement as set forth in claim 18. Applicant notes that when damping agent is to be transferred, especially for eventual transfer to a plate cylinder, the damping agent should be evenly applied. The irregular and partial arrangement of hydrophilic and oleophilic areas in Jentzsch '833 would prevent the even transfer of damping agent. Therefore it is applicant's position that it would not be obvious to modify Jentzsch '833 or to modify another reference by adding the roll 4 of Jentzsch '833, in order to cause claim 18 to be obvious. Claim 18 therefore further defines over the prior art.

Claims 13 and 28 set forth similar features, and therefore these claims also define over the prior art.

Claims 16, 23 and 28 set forth that the oscillator moves the roll to and fro by a predetermined stroke, and that the width of the ink repellent area is larger than this stroke. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of these features in the prior art, and therefore these claims further define over the prior art.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:tf
71366RCE.15
DATED:

May 8, 2006
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.